Topics
My posts
Drafts
Preferences
More
CATEGORIES
Philosophy
Society, Government…
Science, Technology,…
Psychology and Mind
Religion and Spiritua…
Creative Writing

Existence Is Infinite (2025)

Philosophy Forums Philosophy

Oct 1
4 / 198
Oct 1
2d ago

daniel j lavender Oct 1

Existence is infinite.

This is evident in two ways:

1.) Existence is infinite or unlimited. *This simply means existence is not limited to any particular.*

This is readily observed and easily confirmed. Existence is not limited to a tree. Existence is not limited to a single house. Existence is not limited to planet Earth. Things other than these are perceived; other trees, other houses, the Moon, Mars, etcetera. Existence is not limited to any particular.

2.) To further illustrate the infinitude of existence I offer the following challenge:

Locate nothing or nonexistence.

Inability to do so is further evidence of the infinitude of existence. *Not only is existence not limited to any particular, existence is not limited by nonexistence as nonexistence is not and cannot be.*

Existence is infinite, existence is unlimited. Only nothing or nonexistence could actually limit existence however nothing or nonexistence is not and cannot be.

The framework has two strong, functional supports. Existence cannot be restricted to any particular indicating no internal restriction and nonexistence cannot be substantiated indicating no external restriction.

daniel j lavender Oct 1

“Nothing” And Sloppy Language

Use of the term “nothing” is often indicative of sloppy language. One such expression is “I have nothing in my pocket”. Is it really an accurate statement?

First let’s establish what a pocket is. A pocket is, in common parlance, typically a compartment or area designed for, designated for, or capable of storage. This considered a pocket would practically always concern space or room for containment. A pocket, such as a pants pocket, almost always contains lint, or tiny fibers, keys, coins or even air. Unless the pocket is vacuum-sealed and airtight, which obviously is quite impractical. A pocket, by definition, concerns storage, it concerns room for some thing or some other thing. For a pocket to contain nothing, for there to be nothing in a pocket including room for containment the pocket or compartment material would have to be completely collapsed, completely condensed, sealed and secured with no capacity for storage. In which case it wouldn’t be capable of storage or capable of containment anyway. It would virtually be complete integration. There wouldn’t be anything contained within because there couldn’t be anything contained within. It wouldn’t be a pocket. It would seemingly be some extremely dense fabric or mass incapable of containment. Which of course would be something and not nothing. It’s a fallacious statement all the way around.

A similar statement is “nothing is on the table”. To demonstrate how this is erroneous one simply has to reference the lacquer or the coat of finish on the table. Or the microscopic dust particles or fibers upon the table undetectable to the unaided eye. From another perspective perhaps the very implications of “on the table” should be examined. By “on the table” is it meant “making contact with the table”? In which case air, as well, would be “on the table” as air would be making contact with the table. In other words, there are things on the table. There is not nothing, there is not no thing on the table. Nothing, no thing, does not exist to be on anything.

Someone may claim to hear nothing. However nothing is not heard. What is heard, what is perceived is silence. A condition, a circumstance is perceived. Else it could not be discussed or acknowledged. That which is perceived is, by definition, existence. Silence is something, not nothing. A word, a sound is perceived. Sound is something, not nothing. In the instance one lacks faculty of hearing one simply wouldn’t hear. Period. One would not “hear nothing”. Nothing is not and cannot be to be heard or sensed.

Someone may claim to smell nothing. However this would be incorrect. The individual would be smelling, they would be perceiving, they would just be smelling or perceiving a neutral environment. They would be smelling, or breathing, neutral atmosphere. They wouldn’t be smelling an unpleasant nor pleasant odor. There would be no distinct, obvious odor or smell to identify. What is smelling? Breathing in particulates and determining certain characteristics such as foul or pleasant odor. The subject would simply be smelling or breathing in a neutral environment, breathing in neither foul nor pleasant but neutral atmosphere.

Use of the term “nothing” is often indicative of sloppy language. “I got it for nothing.” “I have nothing in my bank account.” These are two more examples. Both statements are false and prime examples of sloppy language. The individual did not get whatever item for nothing or for no thing. The individual obtained whatever item for themselves or for someone else or for some purpose or some application. In the sense that no money or item of trade was used in the acquisition nothing is still not introduced or present. Rather money nor an item of trade was needed in the process; some particular thing, an existent thing, is simply not involved in that particular case. Still only things are involved; individuals, items, etc. Nothing or no thing is not introduced or involved because no thing is not and cannot be to be involved. The very notion of nothing or no thing itself is a concept, a contradictory concept, an abstraction of the mind and is also a thing. The individual does not have nothing in their bank account. They may have no funds but that does not indicate nothing. At the very least they have digits, they have address and contact details, they have information in their bank account. Nothing, no thing does not actually exist. Nothing, no thing does not actually have presence to be referenced. What actually is referenced is some particular thing which is not present or involved in that particular case.